# One Deont Violation

1. Interpretation--If the neg runs <INSERT DEONTIC STANDARD>, then the contention must include only one violation back to the standard.
2. Violation--There are multiple offensive arguments impacting to his standard, SUCH AS \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.
3. Standards:
4. Reciprocity--Each violation functions as an independent no-risk issue. This is illustrated in CX when we had an extensive conversation about whether <INSERT DEONTIC STANDARD> is black and white. The lack of a brightline just confirms what we all already know: either the aff is <DEONTIC STANDARD> or it is not, there are no shades of grey in between.

This means that all the contentions function as NIBs. He just has to win one, while I have to win terminal defense on all of them. This gives the neg a 3:1 structural advantage and creates a moving target because I can never know which piece of offense he will extend in the 2N. This kills fairness because it encourages the 2N to go for what I undercover least and makes the 1AR functionally impossible. Also kills time skew because you make large portions of my 1AR irrelevant come the 2AR, which is particularly ridiculous because your NC lets you leverage the full value of the entire 2N.

1. Resolvability—if I were to turn a contention, that would lead to an irresolvable ballot because there’s no way to have both sides win under an absolute framing. Resolvability is k2 fairness, because if a ballot can’t be clearly adjudicated, the judge is forced to intervene, something fundamentally unfair to one debater.

# Descriptive Standards Bad

A interp—neither debater may read frameworks that decide the winner based on <SAY THEIR DESCRIPTIVE FW>

B violation

C

1. Turn ground—little a is she eliminates my ability to generate real offense on their case because it relies on factual observations that flow only one way, e.g. something can be consistent or inconsistent with <THEIR FW>, but not both. This means I will never be able to generate turns on the AC since <THEIR FW> already affirms. Even if she proves that there are neg turns I can make, there is still a huge skew in turn ground, or she wouldn’t have read I-Law on the aff. This has the strongest link to fairness because if I can’t functionally turn their case then there’s a 2:1 structural disadvantage against me since I am pigeonholed into winning framework where the aff could go for either.

Little b is lack of quality turns—even if there were turns Aff will always come out ahead because she chose a framework that would probably affirm on face. Quality ground key to ensuring both sides have an equal opportunity under aff framework.

1. Resolvability—if I were to turn a contention, that would lead to an irresolvable ballot because there’s no way to have both sides win under an absolute framing. Resolvability is the biggest internal link, because if a ballot can’t be clearly adjudicated, the judge is forced to intervene, something fundamentally unfair to one debater.
2. Clash: a) since there is little turn ground, I will always be incentivized to not engage the AC and shift to a preclusive layer and b) every debate in your world becomes a comparison of descriptive truths. This destroys topic education and clash since we literally just sit and compare the same finite amount of methodologies that exist on the topic. Clash is key because it’s the mechanism by which in round education occurs. And topic education is uniquely valuable since <THEIR FW ARGS> are just a google search away, but the actual substantive issues on living wages are something that we have an opportunity to discuss NOW. Also key to fairness because debaters who don’t engage in the topic usually are masking weaknesses, letting them win by getting really good at reading sketchy aff frameworks and a ton of theory. Forcing topic debate lets you better determine the best debater.

# CPs Must Be Implemented

A interpretation: All neg counterplans need to be a) disclosed if they have been read before and b) need to be currently implemented somewhere in the status quo

B violation

C standards

1. Predictability: there are literally thousands of solutions proposed in the history of economic thought for solving poverty, and the aff can’t be expected to know and prep all of them. Limiting CP’s to solutions currently found in status quo maximizes predictability. Predictability is the basis of all claims and pre round prep because it doesn’t matter how great something is if we can’t predict it. This checks back depth because there’s no depth if there’s clash
2. Topic lit: literature on solutions that are not currently implemented is sparse. Economic researchers are more likely to analyze solutions being currently implemented because that’s where the funding lies. A disproportionate skew in the quality of lit for CPs is unfair because he’ll always have better empirics on it, and kills educational value bc the CP isn’t educational if it’s biased

EITC or no MW

# Straight Ref Bad

1. Both debaters must defend an advocacy with a unique framework

B violation

C standards

1. Phil Ed –
   1. Phil ed best happens with a clash of ethical theories because the dialectic comparison allows for unique education in LD, but neg straight ref deliberately kills this.
   2. Also, straight ref allows neg not to prep an NC which is bad since a substantial source of education results from prepping ethical theories
   3. Phil ed is key to education because it promotes critical advocacy skills and unique applications of thought. Phil ed outweighs topic ed because it’s more abstract. Empirically verified because our topic arguments are framed by standards
   4. Phil ed is key to fairness because comparative ethical theories are necessary to use
2. Reciprocity – straight ref allows neg to have a structural advantage because they don’t have to defend an NC, meaning that the AC strat doesn’t have a second tier to weigh offense with. Neg may say that there’s no disadvantage because we’re both limited to just an AC but neg chose straight ref knowing that AC would be overwhelmed. Further, the 7 min dump is inherently irreciprocal. Reciprocity is key to fairness because it ensures equal access to the ballot.

# CX Checks Bad

A. Interpretation—The AC cannot require the negative to clarify 1AC advocacy during cross ex. In other words, CX checks are a horrible norm for debate, and the negative should be able to run theory without using CX as a check.

B. Violation—Call for the AC. It says explicitly, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. Also, this interp is offensive. Saying otherwise is stupid because it misunderstands the difference between a counterinterp and interp. This argument creates terrible norms because it relies on a false understanding of what makes something an interpretation or a counterinterp. Interps are distinct from counterinterps because interps exclude practices from the round while counterinterps include practices into the round.

For example, consider 2 common shells: NIBs bad and CX checks bad. In your world, CX checks bad and NIBs bad would be counterinterps, which is absurd. Both of these theory shells read by the negative would exclude practices found in the 1AC. If the aff has a NIB or an argument that all interps must be checked in CX, neg theory indicts would conclude that we should exclude those arguments from the round because they are unfair. Aff would argue that we should include those practices because they are fair. The difference is that the interpretation concludes a practice is unfair and should be excluded whereas counterinterps conclude a practice is fair and should be included.

Norm setting key to fairness because it encourages progress over time, thereby checking abuse in future debates.

C. Standards

1. Advocacy shift—CX checks allows the aff an opportunity to change its vision of a fair debate after the reading of the 1AC, which is the definition of an advocacy shift. It is just an excuse to change your advocacy after the fact because you are not ready to defend it. Letting the 1AC flip-flop out of its original positions is unfair because it inevitably leads to the aff cherry picking which theory interps it will concede and not concede depending on who they are debating. If the aff is worried that the neg is better at theory, it will become overly concessional in cross-ex and use CX as a way to shift from its original interpretations of what a fair debate looks like. This is particularly inexcusable given that you had infinite prep time to construct and frontline your version of a fair debate.

Also links to strat skew because aff representing the AC differently based on who’s neg artificially denies possible neg options. This kills fairness because when the AC preemptively destroys neg strat, negs ability to coherently respond is shot. Strat skew links to fairness because I’m at a disadvantage if I can’t formulate a strat to the ballot.

2. Value of CX—Cross-ex is becoming a lost art. There is a big difference between cross-examining a position and clarifying what the position is. The point of CX is to do the former, not the latter. Your norm for debate just further encourages debaters to not work at becoming good at questioning their opponents. Furthermore, there is no reason we need to use CX as clarification, because you had literally 6 minutes to clarify what you defended. The only world in which CX needs to be used as clarification is a world in which I suck at flowing or the aff was purposely vague.

Value of CX is key to both education and fairness. Key to education because CX and the ability to ask good questions is one of the most unique skills garnered in LD debate, and that will help us for the rest of life. Key to fairness because it allows the aff to waste negative CX time and keeps the negative from truly hammering the aff on particular issues. This is also a link to time skew—when the aff can permissibly waste neg time then the ability to formulate arguments is dampened. Without time to have arguments, nothing about them is relevant.

## A2 Literally takes 15 seconds—abuse is marginal

* + - 1. TURN—CX checks encourages debaters to be sketchy in CX and not concede anything or try to clarify things for too long.
      2. Terminal D—this is an empirical claim without an empirical warrant
      3. No impact—if I win theory is an issue of competing interps, your argument becomes irrelevant because marginal abuse is still abuse, and competing interps dictates that I come out ahead on that particular abuse story.
      4. Link defense—Even if abuse seems marginal in this round, it compounds over rounds to waste huge amounts of time. It isn’t marginal over a 4 year career or in all the rounds in which it happens as a norm. Aggregation outweighs
      5. No impact—This argument is at best link defense, it even concedes that there is abuse, meaning that even if you buy this arg, you still vote on the shell
      6. Impact comparison—value of CX/advocacy shift OUTWEIGHS your marginality claims.

## A2 Prevents frivolous theory

1. Impact comparison—aff cherry picking is worse than neg reading frivolous theory.
2. Non-unique—There will always be frivolous theory. Even today where many run CX checks, we all know theory isn’t going away.
3. Alternative solvency—several other methods exist within debate to prevent frivolous theory, such as RVI’s, reject arg/debate, reasonability, and actually fair AC’s. There is no reason the aff uniquely needs CX checks as the mechanism to prevent frivolous theory.
4. No impact—If it’s frivolous, then aff can easily beat it with a 10sec I meet
5. Turn—theory debate, no matter how marginal, is educational because it forces both debaters to defend their advocacies from a critical perspective.
6. Link defense—the brightline at which theory becomes frivolous is really murky at best and is at worst non-existant. A brightline here is crucial because unless you have unique reason to believe at one point something changes, then to vote on it would be arbitrary.

## A2 Losing CX time is non-falsifiable, i.e. potential not real abuse

1. No warrant—CX time IS lost because you literally REQUIRE me to run my theory interps by you in CX. Even if it didn’t happen in this debate, it happens all the time.
2. No warrant—the fact that it didn’t happen in this debate is sort of the point of reading this shell. I spent all of CX actually cross-examining your arguments.
3. No impact—no reason why falsifiability crucial. At a certain point, everything is non-falsifiable.

## **A2 CX checks deters abusive 1ACs because the aff is no longer able to make ridiculous I meets**.

1. Non-unique—If the I meets are ridiculous, then there’s no reason that they would work without CX checks. CX checks is procedural and I meets are substantial, they’re two independent levels of debate
2. Turn—CX checks promotes abusive ACs because they’re just as abusive regardless if they’re called out in CX or not, but in a world of CX checks, either aff can hide the abuse in CX or if it’s not brought up, the abuse can’t be punished.
3. Nonresponsive—checking the aff in cross-ex doesn’t mean they only can make I meets, they can also drop or shift from the position entirely.

## A2 CX enough to check all theory interps in the 1ac—you have 7 minutes of prep time.

1. Nonresponsive—If I win prep skew then this argument further bites. It’s not whether I could use my CX, it’s that I shouldn’t have to use my prep time to check theory—that’s the entire point of this shell!

# Bidirectional Paradigm

A interp—all theory paradigms must be proactively bidirectional in the AC. In other words, if he claims RVIs, he must say I get RVIs. If he says I don’t get drop the debater, he must say he doesn’t get it either.

B violation—

C standards

1. Theory debate—little a is when he gets an RVI but I don’t, there is a discrepancy between our ability to layer. In his world, the 1ar will always introduce a risk-free preclusive layer, like Scarsdale or Bob Overing who can read AFC or straight-ref bad in the 1ar. This means the 2nr will always be split between undercovering theory so the 2ar will get an easy win on theory or overcovering on it such that the value of my 2nr is weakened, and he gets to proportionately spend more time on the winning issues on substance by kicking theory in the 2ar. These checks from the AC do too much than just prevention of frivolous theory in the NC theory because now the 1ar will always run it.

Little b is when he gets reject the debater and I only have reject the arg, AC abuse is uniquely encouraged because whatever paradigmatic issues he raises, they’re only a reason to drop those specific arguments, causing a huge skew in NC ability to respond both theoretically because it’s not worth investing a minute to take out a 15 second blip and substantively, because the theory operates as a preclusive filter on substance.

This links into time skew because the value of the 2N is inevitably bifurcated. Checking abusive theory debate comes first under any voter because it’s a gateway issue-- checking abuse is the point of theory in the first place. If we endorse abusive theory then we endorse abusive positions. Links to clash because the 1ar ability to introduce a new preclusive layer means we shirk topic discussion in favor of prestandards which prevent it.

1. Stable Advocacy—when he doesn’t take a stance on whether neg gets access to some practice aff gets access to, then he has an unstable advocacy. If my NC invests a lot of time to get the same practice or runs theory saying it ought to be bidirectional, he’ll just say that I could’ve had access to it all along, but if I don’t waste enough time in the NC justifying it he’ll extrapolate it in the 1ar that I don’t get the practice. This also links into time skew because under either scenario neg’s time is halved—either I have to waste time in the NC to prevent frivolous theory, or I have to respond to it in the 2N.

Moving targets kill fairness and education because they moot the ability for a starting point for NC responsiveness. A skew in in-round predictability means he’ll always be strategically ahead of my NC. Time skew kills fairness and education because it doesn’t matter how good your arguments are if you don’t have time to make them.

## Stuff About Side Bias

**1. Link Turn:** aff speak 3 times; I only speak twice, which means

a) aff control the perceptual advantage in the round;

b) aff get the last say on all arguments in the round, meaning aff can spin issues however they want, and

c) aff gets to introduce the framework, meaning that if you write a really strategic AC, you set yourself up in a great position to win. This is verified by the fact that several TOC winners in the last 5 years won the majority of TOC out rounds on the aff WITH THE SAME AFF, e.g. Catherine Tarnsey and Rebecca Kuang.

**2. Link Turn:** the 1AR controls the direction of the round because how you collapse determines what the 2N does and how the 2AR functions. You can kick aff framework, introduce theory, collapse to an RVI, etc. You have the power to change the direction of the round however you want in that speech. The fact that you are bad at affirming doesn't mean affirming is harder than negating.

**3. Empirical Flaw:** your stats don’t control for

a) quality of debaters. There have been debaters in the past who rarely lose aff rounds, and when they do, it's because they screwed up. Affirming is an art you have to get better at, it's not harder than negating, it's just different.

b) topic biases. There have been out rounds at TOC where affs have won the majority of debates—e.g. 2014 and 2012 TOC. This also link turns your empirics arguments because TOC outrounds is a better representation of side bias.

These flaws are supercharged by the marginal difference in side bias—7% really isn’t a big statistical discrepancy, so controlling for confounding variables is even more crucial.

**4. Terminal Link Defense:** we affirm an equal number of times so this theory violation is non-unique. You get the disadvantage and advantage an equal number of times. Counter-balancing in this round makes no sense since the structure of the tournament is an intrinsic counter-balance.

**5. Alternative solvency:** even if you are right that affirming is harder, your solution counter-balances too much in your favor. There is no reason why you need \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. The aff can get leeway on framework or definitions.

NOTE: THE CONTENT OF THIS ARG CHANGES DEPENDING ON WHAT THE AFF ARGUED

# Flash, Pass, or Cash: No one Rides for Free

A. Interpretation—Both debaters must either have paper copies of all evidence and pre-written analytics or must flash the arguments on a USB drive PRIOR to giving their speech.

B. Violation—

C. Standards

1/ Clash—my interpretation is best for clash because it best facilitates debaters understanding arguments their opponents are reading DURING THE SPEECH. Otherwise, I have to wait until cross ex or prep time to get access to your computer, which hinders my ability to read the un-underlined portions of your evidence and to fully understand all arguments that I missed due to unclear spreading. Also, remember that this is an issue of comparative analysis—there is no way the world of the counterinterp comes out AHEAD on clash.

Clash is key to fairness; without it you allow debaters with better prep and coaching to always win, rather than interacting with arguments in round. The only way to determine the better debater is to vote on in round clash, as that’s the only way judges can fairly determine the better debater.

2/ Norm setting—this interpretation is best for debate. Prior to computers becoming popular in LD, everyone printed cases and handed pages as they read them. Once the transition to computers happened, people started flashing or emailing the speech docs. There is NO net benefit to the counterinterp—s/he’s just free riding the system and being a poor sport. The majority of the community has abided by this policy because it is the best practice to facilitate in round argumentation.

Norm setting is key to fairness because it means that people stop doing unfair things. Without normsetting, people wouldn’t follow any rules.

3/ Reciprocity—I handed my case on a flash to my opponent but he didn’t. This gives them a substantive prep advantage in the debate.

Reciprocity is key to fairness because it ensures that both debaters have the same ability to win the round and fairness requires that both debaters have an equitable footing.

4/ Academic Integrity—my interp ensures both debaters have cut cards correctly and that evidence is not miscut. This is an issue of comparative analysis—there’s no way the counterinterp comes out ahead on checks. Even if debaters reading the evidence don’t always figure it out, we’re more likely to correctly determine this if everyone has access to it. Without the interp, aff/neg could just read 6 minutes of evidence they wrote themselves and there’s no way to check it back.

Academic integrity is the most important theory impact because the validity of all other impacts comes into question when integrity isn’t present. This means that having academic integrity is a functional prerequisite to voting on anything.

PREEMPTS:

**FRONTLINES**

### AT Don’t flash because I don’t want my prep stolen

1. I offered to delete it in front of you or even let you delete it
2. This is just potential abuse not real abuse--- you need to trust people at some point; you’re asking me to trust you to not miscut cards, but trust is a two way street
3. Your abuse is much worse--- You literally make it so I can’t engage in the round to the same extent that you can

### AT Don’t flash because my coach won’t let me

1. Community norms are more important than your school/coach norms—your coach is just a small part of the community.
2. I will personally have a conversation with your coach about this and get it fixed after the round
3. Your coach will probably change their mind once you lose a couple of rounds to it—don’t say that you shouldn’t be punished for something your coach did because A) you’re trying to punish me because your coach has their own rules and B) you’re the best person to convince your coach to change their mind; the rest of us can only do so much.
4. My coach won’t let me NOT flash or pass pages; if this response sounds like bullshit, that’s because your original argument says the same thing

### AT Don’t flash because you will read ahead

1. Kills ability to make responses while reading along too—this abuse is worse than the potential abuse of me reading ahead because at worse I read 30 seconds ahead, but you make me wait 6 minutes.
2. Nonunique—you can do it too
3. This functions as a bullshit filter—debaters are more likely to make quality arguments if their opponents take the time to closely evaluate them

### AT You can just read along with my laptop

1. That’s an absurd alternative--- I need to flow
2. You kill my ability to make responses to arguments as you make them --- this means you get way more prep time than me
3. Your laptop screen is too dim, the text is too small, and you scroll too fast, and I kinda suck at flowing--- all of these add up to the point where your lack of
4. This lets you hide all the un-underlined text; kills academic integrity because even if you specifically are an honest person, A) I don’t know you and B) There’s some shady people out there

### AT I’ll give you my laptop during your CX and prep time

1. Cross-ex is becoming a lost art. There is a big difference between cross-examining a position and clarifying what the position is. The point of CX is to do the former, not the latter. Your norm for debate just further encourages debaters to not work at becoming good at questioning their opponents.
2. Too little, too late--- you can’t make up for the <insert minutes here> minutes I lost. This is enough to tip the round in your favor because we literally only get 4 minutes for the entire round. This more than halves my prep
3. I need to see your cards during my speech so I can attack the exact rhetoric and details used.

### AT Abuse is frivolous

1. T: you not consenting to a simple request is frivolous--- I lose way more than you claim to gain
2. This supercharges norm setting—if you lose on something this stupid, it’s easier for you to just stop doing the abusive practice.
3. This begs the question of the entire theory shell--- you need to beat back clash, norm setting, reciprocity, and academic integrity before you can even get access to this argument
4. All it takes is a little bit of abuse to tip the round in your favor. <insert weighing>.

### AT I’m fine with you not flashing

1. That advantages debaters with lots of resources, it makes debate into spreading each other out because whoever is better at flowing wins
2. That’s a false comparison—I let you choose, you don’t let me

# TJF+Substance Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters cannot read both theoretical and substantive justifications for the framework debate.
2. Violation
3. Standards:
   * 1. Theory justifications skew time and kill clash. 2 warrants: a) You skew speech time by mooting the value of non-theory framework justifications. I don’t have access to <INSERT SUBSTANTIVE ARGS YOU READ>. This is verified abuse—it doesn’t matter how those args play out anymore because you introduced a preclusive layer. b) Theory justifications encourage debaters to not clash on the original layer in the debate by incentivizing debaters just go a level higher. Key to fairness because time is necessary to make arguments and clash helps determine who the better debater is by making the round a test of skill, not who the better trickster is. Abuse is also irreversible because you can’t take back the theory justifications you just introduced.
     2. Philosophical education. Using theoretical standards to justify frameworks kills phil ed because they encourage debaters to a) less substantively justify their framework, b) bastardize phil lit to make the other team overcommit on substantive justifications, c) collapse to the theory justifications and not extend the substantive ones, and d) hone theory skills rather than reading phil lit when theory can act as a preclusive layer. That’s key to education because it forces debaters to discuss complex ethical ideas, encouraging higher level critical thinking. Finally, phil education precludes a) fairness because we need to have philosophical education to understand what it means to be fair and b) education because philosophy teaches us what is valuable, so even if we can make good decisions with other education, we won’t make ethically valuable ones.

# Counterinterp Theory

A) Interpretation: Aff may not claim that all interps read by the negs are implicit counter-interps.  
  
B) Violation:

C) Standards:

1) Strategy Skew—the implicit counterinterp argument incentivizes the aff to be as abusive as possible since neg has to win both a counterinterp and then an RVI against abusive aff positions. This allows the aff 2 ways out in the 1AR against all neg theory, i.e. it can read theory is not an RVI or that the aff was fair.

Individual arguments are pieces of a larger picture. Without being able to form a strategy, you can never win.

2) Norm setting—this argument creates terrible norms because it relies on a false understanding of what makes something an interpretation or a counterinterp. Interps are distinct from counterinterps because interps exclude practices from the round while counterinterps include practices into the round.

For example, consider 2 common shells: NIBs bad and CX checks bad. In your world, CX checks bad and NIBs bad would be counterinterps, which is absurd. Both of these theory shells read by the negative would exclude practices found in the 1AC. If the aff has a NIB or an argument that all interps must be checked in CX, neg theory indicts would conclude that we should exclude those arguments from the round because they are unfair. Aff would argue that we should include those practices because they are fair. The difference is that the interpretation concludes a practice is unfair and should be excluded whereas counterinterps conclude a practice is fair and should be included.

Norm setting key to fairness because it encourages progress over time, thereby checking abuse in future debates. Voting the aff down in this debate is key because it will encourage them to never include this terrible argument in future AC’s they write.

# FW Must be Theoretical

1. Interpretation: Debaters must justify ethical frameworks only through appeal to the theoretical virtues of those frameworks contextualized in terms of fairness, education, or other voters. To clarify, philosophical reductions, metaethical argumentation, and other framework arguments are not allowed under my interp.
2. Violation –
3. Standards
4. Phil Education – Framework debate is extremely detrimental to philosophical education for four reasons
5. The format of modern analytic and continental philosophy is fundamentally incongruous with debate's conventions regarding standards of proof, the value of intuition, and carding practices. Good philosophical papers are dozens of pages long and often develop a single argument from front to back. Attempts to capture the entirety of these arguments in small paragraph sized chunks are impossible.
6. Low quality arguments and misconceptions plague phil discussion. Nebel[[1]](#footnote-1) et Al 13

Some features of LD debate, as it is practiced today, encourage students to misrepresent philosophical arguments, ignore subtle distinctions, and oversimplify ideas. Here is one reason why. Debaters have limited speech time, so one reliable way to win is by overwhelming one’s opponent with objections. Instead of developing the best version of the best objection to each argument, debaters often make as many objections as they can think of, regardless of their quality. Why? Because a false argument is strategic so long as the explanation of its falsity is more time intensive than the argument itself. Students know that this strategy is successful, so they try to replicate it by learning how to generate large numbers of objections. Unfortunately, learning how to make more objections usually trades off with learning how to make better objections. (Perhaps it need not be this way, but that is the status quo.) So, many debaters, including the most successful ones, learn not to care about the quality of an argument. They internalize the view that any argument is worth making as long as it maximizes the debater’s time tradeoff—that is, the ratio of how long her opponent spends answering her objection compared to how long the objection took to develop. Sometimes, explaining an argument in the kind of depth and precision that philosophers use has little marginal value in terms of the debater’s time tradeoff. As long as she can get the basic argument out there, she can force her opponent to waste her time answering it. If the answers are poor, then all the better. If the answers are good, the debater will just dig in on a different argument, and it will not matter. Of course, some debates involve well developed arguments with thoughtful objections and an interesting dialectic that often mirrors current academic debates on the issue. But these are extremely rare because it is often easier and more efficient to oversimplify. Furthermore, the misunderstanding and oversimplification of some of the philosophical literature used in LD debate is a persistent problem. In our experience, the vast majority of students and instructors in LD debate use the word “utilitarianism” to describe any moral principle according to which the consequences of an act are relevant. This is a mistake because [but] there are many non-utilitarian version of consequentialism, and because many non-consequentialists agree that consequences matter (they just aren’t all that matters). Is this too much nuance to expect from high school students? Maybe, but we think it would be better if debaters used no technical terms rather than incorrect ones. Misusing terms leads students to misinterpret what they read and, therefore, misunderstand the philosophy. Moreover, misusing terms may lead students to develop false beliefs about the philosophical terrain. Students who use “utilitarianism” incorrectly may end up believing that the only plausible view on which consequences matter is the theory that requires us to maximize total well-being. These students will believe in false dilemmas.

1. Debate teaches equivocation and structural issues such as speed prevent education. Nebel[[2]](#footnote-2) et Al 13

A more pernicious worry is that sometimes LD debaters will go as far as to intentionally misrepresent or distort arguments found in the philosophical literature. Debaters may read excerpts from various philosophers discussing the relationship between reason and moral responsibility while glossing over the subtleties of each thinker’s views, if not outright equivocating between fundamentally distinct uses of the relevant terminology. Members of the community are often complacent in regards to these practices. To see how widely our impressions held, we conducted a survey of 245 debaters, coaches, and judges. The respondents were readers of a debate blog—mostly current debaters, but nearly 80 coaches and 20 former debaters. 74 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the following statement: “Many arguments that succeed in LD are too poorly explained or read too fast to be adequately understood and answered” (see Figure 1). Similarly, 62 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that “debaters often misrepresent their evidence” (see Figure 2)

1. Judge paradigms cause a race to the bottom for philosophical argumentation and encourage morally bankrupt strategies such as skepticism. Nebel[[3]](#footnote-3) et Al 13

Another cause of poorly justified relativism and skepticism in LD debate comes from judge expectations. Judges are advised not to intervene—that is, not to use their prior opinions about the resolution when deciding who won any given debate. That would be unfair, say some debaters and coaches, since it would advantage one debater over her opponent.9 Yet judges of LD debate today often take an even stronger view than this one. Instead of abstaining from intervention about the resolution, judges try to abandon all of their prior opinions about everything. While this ideal is impossible to achieve, its proponents believe that judges should try to reduce the influence of their own views as much as possible. They argue that judges should let debaters defend whatever they wish, which is often defended on the grounds that there are no right answers to moral questions, or that the answers depend on the students’ own beliefs. LD debaters tend to welcome this opposition to intervention because it gives them greater freedom to choose strategies that increase their odds of winning. They also tend to accept every view supporting this idea without much thought or criticism, including views like moral relativism and skepticism. Debaters sometimes like arguments because of their conclusions—after all, they work hard to find the ones they need—not because of their quality and evidential support. The problem, then, is that debaters are inclined to accept a controversial philosophical view about morality for the wrong reasons.

Phil education is key to fairness because it prevents blippy, unclear framework debates that are ripe for judge intervention and frames what impacts matter in the round. Preventing harms to phil education outweigh other links to education a) it’s the most severe impact as we perpetuate false statements about philosophy without acknowledging it and b) they prevent knowledge in debate from being portable because phil education is actively harmed.

1. Voter – Fairness is a voter because debate is a competitive activity based on skill and wins and losses. Education is a voter because it’s the primary purpose of debate and we gain access to a unique forum for discussion and clash.

My interp is not saying that philosophical education is bad – I’m all for philosophy just not the way that we debate it in LD. To win a counter interp the aff would have to prove that LD creates philosophical education, not just that philosophical education is good.

# Deont Spec

A) Interpretation: If debaters run means based framework [be specific for what they say], they must specify actors and advocate a method of implementation in an advocacy text. To clarify, this interp does not mean that all debates must have specified actors and implementation. My argument is specific to debates that are means based.

B) Violation:

C) Standards:

1) Resolvability—deontic principles need an agent and implementation in order to show an obligation to act. The difference between murder and surgery is the years of medical experience of the actor. And, for there to be an obligation, it must be shown that that obligation is possible. We would not place a burden for an infant to save a drowning man if we deemed all must save drowning men because that infant lacks the faculties necessary to save the drowning man. This means absent of all other arguments, the AC would result in ballot paralysis because there is nothing actually shown under the AC. Ensuring resolvability is enough by itself to trigger the voter, because without resolvability, then there is no point of having debate, because nothing would mean anything. Further, it also internally links into fairness because if there is no way to resolve the ballot, then the judge must intervene, something fundamentally unfair to one debater.

2) Strat Skew—deontic frameworks contain an incredibly large amount of possibility for actors and implementation, each with its own unique possibilities. For example, maintaining a categorical rule may be different for a governmental actor in South Africa than a NGO in Northern Russian than an autonomous collective of individuals in America. This is key to fairness because it creates a stable advocacy meaning the AC can’t shift in the 1AR to exclude neg offense or turns. When I face a moving target, I am fatally harmed in my ability to win the round.

# Methodology

A) Interpretation: For every empiric on the economic effect of living wages, both debaters must be able to provide the following in CX: size, scope of study, duration of study, author quals and variables controlled for, and this information must be readily available during cross ex. Handing me the entire study methodology or article isn’t sufficient to meet this interp.

B) Violation: he couldn’t answer questions about the empirical details of <INSERT STUDIES> in CX. All he could do is offer me the article methodology, which as articulated above, doesn’t cut it.

C) Standards

1. Weighing ground--I can’t compare 2 contradictory pieces of empirical evidence if my opponent doesn’t know how their empirical claims were derived. Saying I don’t know is the equivalent to not having an empirical warrant since the details of the study are what give the study legitimacy. For all we know my opponents evidence has a sample size of 10 people in the most conservative part of Texas, which is clearly a terrible study. 3 impacts:

A) Weighing ground critical to fairness because it lets debaters compare contradictory claims systematically. Otherwise empirical debates devolve to who can read the most number of cards, which makes adjudicating the round impossible.

B) Weighing ground also key to education because it teaches debaters what makes an empirical study strong and how to compare 2 conflicting pieces of empirical evidence. This trains debaters to be better critical thinkers and lets them parse through thick amounts of empirical data quickly, a key skill for any researcher or policymaker.

C) Lack of weighing ground kills cost benefit debate because it’s the mechanism by which the judge decides who wins the link debate on util impacts, which means the interp solves for irresolvable util debates.

1. Academic integrity—not having the methodology means I can’t verify the validity of their studies or how my opponent cuts their statistics, meaning there’s no recourse to check against abusive cuts or power tagging of evidence, which makes the evidence seem better than it is. The interp is key to prevent LD’ers from lifting evidence from random, sketchy articles and not understanding the meaning behind it.

Academic integrity is the most important theory impact because a) you as a judge have an obligation to uphold community norms—you wouldn’t vote on racist args, just like you shouldn’t vote for him if we can’t have verification of his evidence and b) the validity of all other impacts comes into question when integrity isn’t present. This means that having academic integrity is a functional prerequisite to voting on anything.

D) Voter: READ VOTERS FROM VOTER FILE

This shell in particular needs to be a voter to set good norms. If they simply lose access to the empirical cards they read, they won’t be incentivized to find their methodologies moving forward. Dropping them will force them to take the extra 3 hours it would take to go through all the cards in their files that are empirical and figure out what the details of the studies are. Otherwise they will keep giving the same vague answers moving forward.

AT I GAVE YOU THE STUDY

1) Giving me the study in CX and expecting me to go through the entire methodology in 4 minutes of prep time is absurd. Burden of proof is on you to know HOW your studies were conducted. There’s no reason you should be able to cut the card from the article and then expect me to read your article in 4 minutes.

2) Better norms are set when the debater running the empiric is responsible for knowing the empirical data because that debater has ample opportunity pre-round to compile the relevant information. It takes 10 minutes per study to figure out the sample size, geographic scope, etc. There’s no reason they can’t be expected to do that.

AT IT TAKES TOO MUCH TIME

1) Turn—if it takes you too much time to find the empirical data, I can’t be expected to find it in 4 minutes of prep time.

2) No impact—you should stop reading empirical arguments if you are too lazy to cut methodology.

AT I COULDN’T ACCESS THE ARTICLE

1) No link—plenty of free resources exist that will let you access the article. You clearly found the card from the article, so there’s no reason we shouldn’t expect you to cut the methodology as well.

# Qualification

A interpretation—if a debater reads evidence expressing an expert’s belief or analysis to warrant some scenario, implication, or contextualization, they must read all qualifications of that author’s belief. In other words, this means no cutting around words like “could,” “may,” “might” or <WHATEVER THE AFF/NEG DIDN’T READ>.

Use the spirit of the interp—focusing on the text allows cheap and semantic I-meets that prevent my ability to check abuse or creation of good norms. If I prove the abuse, they should lose regardless of the text.

B violation—

The Standard is Evidence ethics—there are two warrants:

1. Modification of author’s words. Modifying the words of the author, no matter how seemingly subtle, changes the judges’ perception of the arguments because the claim is warranted by the debater now instead of the author. This is also especially problematic since they are using the expertise of the author to establish some empirical truth. This is supercharged in the case of this particular debate because my opponent doesn’t just minorly change the author’s work, s/he totally misrepresent it. There’s a reason no respected academic would say flat out “nukes will cause extinction” or “econ collapse will cause nuke war” because they know they’d get laughed out of the room. This is especially relevant because many decisions come down to comparisons of link stories, and misrepresenting the strength of that claim gives a huge unfair advantage.
2. Weighing ground—it's impossible for me to accurately reflect and understand probability if you misrepresent how effective your policy is when even your author doesn’t believe it. The interp causes not only better evidence but a better debate norm where we can correctly compare evidence—especially relevant when there’s such a huge probability disparity in our worlds.

Nails 15. [Dropped Arguments Are Not True Arguments by Jacob Nails](http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/10/dropped-arguments-are-not-true-arguments-by-jacob-nails/) <http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/10/dropped-arguments-are-not-true-arguments-by-jacob-nails/> 2/10/15

If taken seriously, even this paradigm would substantially diverge from common practice. Take an average four card disadvantage. More than likely, each of those authors hedges their rhetoric with terms like “might” and “could” (often in multiple places per card), which don’t always make it into debaters’ underlining of the evidence. If such “could” claims appear four times in the disadvantage, and each “could” means something like 20-40% risk, then the combined risk of the disadvantage would start at somewhere between 2% and .2%. That’s only after pricing in the uncertainties admitted by the authors, not the opponent’s responses.

Accurate weighing ground is key to evidence ethics because it ensures we correctly portray the implications of our evidence—it’s only as good as its worth within the context of the round.
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